arXiv:1607.00448v1 [q-fin.RM] 2 Jul 2016

Estimation and prediction of credit risk based on rating transition systems

Jinghai Shao[a] Siming Li[b] Yong Li[b]

a: School of Mathematical Sciences, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China

b: School of Statistics, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China

Abstract

Risk management is an important practice in the banking industry. In this paper we develop a new methodology to estimate and predict the probability of default (PD) based on the rating transition matrices, which relates the rating transition matrices to the macroeconomic variables. Our method can overcome the shortcomings of the framework of Belkin et al. (1998), and is especially useful in predicting the PD and doing stress testing. Simulation is conducted at the end, which shows that our method can provide more accurate estimate than that obtained by the method of Belkin et al. (1998).

1 Introduction

Credit risk management has received tremendous attention from the bank industry. Various methods were proposed concerning the estimation and prediction of key risk parameters like probability of default (**PD**). A large volume of literature on credit risk management has evolved. This development was partly reflected by supervisors under the framework of Basel II and Basel III.

In their seminal work on credit spread, Jarrow et al. (1997) derived the risk premium for the credit risk process from a Markov chain (discrete time or continuous time) on a finite state space. Then the estimate of **PD** is derived from the transition matrix of

the Markov chain. Then, the works such as Wilson (1997), Belkin et al. (1998a,b), Alessandrini (1999), Kim (1999), Nickell et al. (2000) identify the important impact of the business cycle on the rating transition matrix. Belkin et al. (1998b) established a one-factor model to measure the business cycle and proposed a method of calculating rating transition matrices conditional on the credit risk. Nickell et al. (2000) quantified the dependence of rating transition matrices on the industry, domicile of the obligor, and the stage of the business cycle by employing ordered probit model. Since one-factor model rules out the possibility that different ratings respond to the same credit condition change at different rates, Wei (2003) established a multi-factor model to overcome this shortcoming and meanwhile retained the main feature of one-factor model [3]. As the models given by [3] and [8] provide a method to obtain fitted rating transition matrices from the variables measured the business cycle, these models can be used in the prediction of rating transition matrix, specifically **PD**, once one get a reasonable prediction of the business cycle. Particularly, this is useful in credit portfolio stress testing. For their simplicity and efficiency, one-factor model [3] or multi-factor model [8] are still practices in the banking industry till today.

However, despite the development of Wei (2003) [8], there are also some shortcomings in the one-factor model proposed by Belkin et al. (1998b) [3]. To be more precise, let us introduce the idea of Belkin et al. (1998b) [3] here and leave the detailed discussion on the model of [3] to Section 2. According to [3], assume that a underlying standard normal random variable X reflects rating migrations. Conditional on an initial credit rating grade i at the beginning of a year, partition the values of X into a set of disjoint intervals (x^i_{j-1}, x^i_j) and i, j belong to the set $\{1, \ldots, K\}$. These series of thresholds satisfy $-\infty = x^i_0 < x^i_1 < \ldots < x^i_{K-1} < x^i_K = +\infty$. X measures changes in creditworthiness, and is assumed to be split into two parts as follows:

$$X = \sqrt{1-\rho}\, Y + \sqrt{\rho} Z, \tag{1}$$

where Y represents idiosyncratic component, unique to a borrower, Z stands for a systematic component, shared by all borrowers, and ρ is a constant taking values in the interval $[0, 1]$. Z is used to measure the credit cycle, and is independent of Y. It is assumed that Y and Z are all standard normally distributed variables. Hence, ρ is the correlation parameter between X and Z, which represents the percentage of the variance of X explained by Z. Suppose that the borrower is initially at the rating grade i. If X is located at the interval $(x^i_{j-1}, x^i_j]$, then it yields that this borrower will be at the grade j this year. Let $P_{ij,t}$ be the rating transition probability at time t from rating grade i to

grade j conditional on the given $Z_t = z$. By the assumption that Y_t is standard normally distributed, it holds

$$P_{ij,t}(z) = \Phi\Big(\frac{x_j^i - \sqrt{\rho}z}{\sqrt{1-\rho}}\Big) - \Phi\Big(\frac{x_{j-1}^i - \sqrt{\rho}z}{\sqrt{1-\rho}}\Big), \quad i,j \in \{1,\dots,K\}, \tag{2}$$

where $\Phi(x)$ denotes the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal variable. According to the law of large number, direct calculation under the help of the assumption on the distribution of Z can yield that

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{t=1}^{N} P_{ij,t} \quad \text{converges almost surely to} \quad \Phi(x_j^i) - \Phi(x_{j-1}^i) \text{ as } N \to +\infty.$$

So it is reasonable to use the average rating transition probability $\bar{P}_{ij} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{t=1}^{N} P_{ij,t}$ to replace the thresholds $\{x_j;\, j = 1,\dots,K\}$. Precisely,

$$\hat{x}_j^i = \Phi^{-1}\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{j} \bar{P}_{ik}\Big).$$

Then, by (2), we get the fitted rating transition probability

$$\hat{P}_{ij,t}(z) = \Phi\Big(\frac{\hat{x}_j^i - \sqrt{\rho}z}{\sqrt{1-\rho}}\Big) - \Phi\Big(\frac{\hat{x}_{j-1}^i - \sqrt{\rho}z}{\sqrt{1-\rho}}\Big), \quad i,j \in \{1,\dots,K\}. \tag{3}$$

The least square problem takes the form as [3] for fixed ρ and t

$$\min_{z} \sum_{i=1}^{K-1}\sum_{j=1}^{K} \frac{n_{t,i}\big(P_{ij,t} - \hat{P}_{ij,t}(z)\big)^2}{\hat{P}_{ij,t}(z)(1-\hat{P}_{ij,t}(z))}, \tag{4}$$

where $P_{ij,t}$ represents the i to j transition rate observed in year t and $n_{t,i}$ the number of borrowers from initial grade i observed in that year. Consequently, we can obtain the fitted rating transition probability matrix via (4) and (3).

The previous procedure is the main step introduced by Belkin et al. [3] to get the fitted rating transition matrix from the variable Z which measures credit cycle. There are two kinds of shortcomings in this methodology. First, the assumption on the distributions of X and Z is not natural and hard to be verified. In the practical application, the extracted series of (Z_t) tends to show that Z is not standard normally distributed. This assumption also causes the appearance of correlation coefficient ρ, whose value is also

difficult to be estimated. Second, the data quantity to extract the series of Z_t is very limited according to (4), which is up to $K \times (K-1)$. When one uses the multi-factor model in Wei (2003) [8], the data quantity in this step is even smaller.

Another important application of the methodology of Belkin et al. [3] is to predict the probability of default and to do stress testing. As variable Z is intended for characterizing the business cycle, one can establish a regression model to link it with some macroeconomic variables. Then the prediction of the macroeconomic variables will lead to a prediction of variable Z, and hence yield a prediction of rating transition matrix and PD by (3). For example, consider the following regression model in order to get the forecast PD:

$$Z = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \xi_1 + \beta_2 \xi_2 + \varepsilon,$$

where ξ_1 denotes the GDP growth, ξ_2 denotes the capacity utilization rate. Once we fix the coefficient β_0, β_1, β_2 using the extracted value of Z by (4) and the known value of ξ_1, ξ_2, we can obtain the forecast value of Z by the forecast value of ξ_1 and ξ_2. However, the assumption that Z is a standard normal random variable is very strange in regression model, which also causes some limitation on the choice of macroeconomic random variables. Belkin et al. (1998b) is important in finding the dependence of rating transition matrices on the business cycle. However, direct application their model to forecast **PD** or do stress testing is not suitable in view of the shortcoming mentioned above.

In this work we propose a new credit risk model, which is called for simplicity a *macroeconomic-risk model*. Analogous to Belkin et al. [3], we also use a latent variable to describe the rating migration **but** without any assumption on its distribution. We split it into three parts: systematic part, idiosyncratic part and random noise. We assume that the idiosyncratic part and random noise are of normal distribution and standard normal distribution respectively. The main difference to [3] lies in the systematic part. In [3], this part has no observed values. However, in our model we shall use some macroeconomic variables to reflect the business cycle, and hence there are observed values for this part. Then under the help of this model, we can use the transformation of rating transition matrices as dependent variable and the macroeconomic variables as explanatory variables to establish a multivariate linear regression model. This method can overcome the shortcomings of Belkin et al. (1998b) mentioned above, and retains to be simplicity to be applied in practise. Moreover, it improves the efficiency of Belkin et al. (1998b), which is showed by simulation in the last section.

This work is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give a precise description on the methodology of [3]. In Section 3, we establish our macroeconomic-risk model and

introduce how to use it to forecast **PD** or do stress testing. In Section 4, we do some simulation and comparison on the efficiency between the approach of [3] and that of our macroeconomic-risk model in predicting rating transition matrices.

2 Overview of One Factor Model

In this section, we give more details on the shortcomings of the one factor model in [3]. There are mainly three problems: the assumption on the distributions of X and Z; the data quantity when solving least square problem; further application of the extracted time series Z_t.

Throughout this work, we assume a rating system with K rating grades, where the K-th grade is the default grade. A 1-year transition matrix is a $K-1 \times K$ matrix with the probabilities that a debtor in rating grade i migrates to rating grade j within 1 year. Following Jarrow et al. [5], the rating transition matrix are modeled as the transition probability matrix of a Markov chain. There are mainly two methods to estimate the transition probability matrices, that is, the cohort method and the duration method. See, for instance, Engolmann and Ermakov [4]. According to the discussion of [4], it is suitable to use the cohort method in our case to derive the empirical transition probability matrix. Namely,

$$\tilde{P}_{ij,t} = \frac{N_{ij,t}}{N_{i,t}}, \tag{5}$$

where $N_{i,t}$ is the number of debtors in rating grade i at the beginning of time period t, and $N_{ij,t}$ is the number of rating transitions from rating grade i to grade j during this period. In Belkin's work [3], to solve the least square problem (4), he indeed used $\tilde{P}_{ij,t}$ defined by (5). Increasing the number of debtors in each rating grade can only improve the quantity of approximation of rating transition matrix by empirical rating transition matrix ($\tilde{P}_{ij,t}$).

As mentioned in the introduction, due to the assumption on the distributions of X and Z, the estimation of ρ in (1) is also a question. Belkin et al. suggested the following approach to estimate ρ. Apply the minimization in (4), using an assumed value of ρ. Then this yields a time series for Z_t conditional on ρ. Repeat this process for many values of ρ and use a numerical search procedure to find the particular ρ value for which Z_t time series has variance of one. This method is not effective and it relies on the viewpoint that the time series Z_t are reasonable sampling of the variable Z. On the other hand, if one

use other method to estimate ρ, for instance, the Basel III asset correlation formula, the obtained estimate ρ can not guarantee the basic assumption on the distributions of X and Z of the one factor model in Belkin et al. [3].

The data quantity in solving the least square problem (4) in [3] is poor. All the data could be used to extract Z_t is at most $K \times (K-1)$. The data quantity could be improved by increasing the number of grades. However, it will decrease the effectiveness of $\tilde{P}_{ij,t}$ to approximate the rating transition matrix.

As a parameter which is created to measure the business cycle, Z_t has no directly observations to back it. When one wants to forecast **PD** or do stress testing using the one factor model, it is necessary to use extracted time series Z_t to run a predicting model. One needs to pay more attention on the risk in this process. Since there is no estimator who can perfectly estimate a parameter, using an estimator set rather than an observation set, one has to bear the risk that the predictor may very much likely magnify the input error.

3 A Macroeconomic-risk model

We use a latent random variable X to reflect rating migrations. Compared with Belkin et al. [3], we do not make any assumption directly on the distribution of X. We assume that X can be split into two parts as follows:

$$X = \boldsymbol{M}^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + Y, \tag{6}$$

where $\boldsymbol{M} = (M_1, \ldots, M_n)^T$ is a vector of given macroeconomic variables which is used to represent business cycle, Y represents idiosyncratic component which is assumed to follow a standard normal distribution. Here and in the sequel A^T stands for the transpose of a matrix A. Assume that Y, $\boldsymbol{M}$ are mutually independent.

Suppose that a borrower is initially at the rating grade i and there exists an underlying set of thresholds $-\infty = x_0^i < x_1^i < \ldots < x_{K-1}^i < x_K^i = +\infty$. To emphasize the initial rating grade, we write X_t^i instead of X_t. Then when X_t^i is located at $(x_{j-1}^i, x_j^i]$, then it means that this borrower will be at the grade j at the end of this time period. Consequently,

$$P_{ij,t}(\boldsymbol{m}) := \mathbb{P}(X_t^i \in (x_{j-1}^i, x_j^i] | \boldsymbol{M}_t = \boldsymbol{m},)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}(x^i_{j-1} < \boldsymbol{m}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}^i + Y < x^i_j)$$
$$= \Phi(x^i_{j-1} - \boldsymbol{m}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}^i) - \Phi(x^i_j - \boldsymbol{m}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}^i),$$

for computational reasons, we use right accumulative function $\Phi(x) = \int_x^\infty \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \mathrm{e}^{-r^2/2} \mathrm{d}r$.

$$\Phi(x^i_j - \boldsymbol{m}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}^i) = \sum_{k=j+1}^{K} P_{ik,t}(\boldsymbol{m}). \tag{7}$$

We obtain that

$$\Phi^{-1}\Big(\sum_{k=j+1}^{K} P_{ij,t}(\boldsymbol{m})\Big) = x^i_j - \boldsymbol{m}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}^i. \tag{8}$$

If we use the estimator $\tilde{P}_{ij,t}$, defined by (5), to estimate $P_{ij,t}(\boldsymbol{m}, y)$, we get

$$U_{ij,t} := \Phi^{-1}\Big(\sum_{k=j+1}^{K} \tilde{P}_{ij,t}\Big) = x^i_j - \boldsymbol{M}^T_t\boldsymbol{\beta}^i + \varepsilon_t, \tag{9}$$

which can be rewritten in the form

$$U_{ij,t} = (1, \boldsymbol{M}^T_t)\begin{pmatrix} x^i_j \\ -\boldsymbol{\beta}^i \end{pmatrix} + \varepsilon_t, \tag{10}$$

where ε_t is the error term caused by this replacement. Note that U_{ij} and $\boldsymbol{M}$ have observations $U_{ij,t}$ and $\boldsymbol{M}_t$ respectively. Hence, (10) becomes a multivariate regression model. The estimation of x^i_j and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^i$ can be given by least square estimator. Let $\hat{x}^i_j$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^i$ be the least square estimators of x^i_j and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^i$ respectively, by (10), we get an estimation

$$\hat{U}_{ij,t} = \hat{x}^i_j - \hat{\boldsymbol{M}}_t{}^T\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^i.$$

By (9), we finally get a fitted rating transition probability $\hat{P}_{ij,t}$ by

$$\hat{P}_{ij,t} = \Phi(\hat{U}_{i(j-1),t}) - \Phi(\hat{U}_{ij,t}). \tag{11}$$

If we want to use the macroeconomic-risk model to forecast **PD** or do stress testing, we can first get a prediction of macroeconomic variable $\boldsymbol{M}_t$, then get the desired estimation of **PD** along the line above.

The macroeconomic-risk model introduced above has two main advantages from theoretical point of view: 1. it does not need to make assumptions on the distributions of latent variable X and the variable Z measuring the credit cycle; 2. there is no appearance of correlation coefficient ρ. Moreover, we shall show in next section by simulation that the fitting effect by using the macroeconomic-risk model is also better than that by using Belkin et al's model.

4 Simulation and Comparison

4.1 Data sets

In this section, we apply Belkin et al's approach and our macroeconomic-risk approach to simulated data sets and make comparison of these two methods. The reason we use simulated data rather than the real one is that, generally speaking an initially i-th grade rated borrower is assumed having a non-zero possibility to be re-rated as any rating grade afterwards, however in real data sets, because of the insufficiency of the data size, this assumption is rarely fulfilled. For example, Table 4.1 shows the transition matrix in 1990Q1, where the horizontal indexes indicate the initial rating grade, and the vertical indexes indicate the becoming rating grade. We can see more than half cells have zero value because of the insufficiency of the data size. This very much likely leads to under-estimated credit risks and to serious computational troubles. To get rid of this computational error, we prefer to using the simulated data to compare our macroeconomic-risk approach with Belkin et al's approach.

1990Q1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	99.65	0.35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0.37	96.33	2.21	0	0	1.10	0	0	0
3	0	0	96.15	0.77	1.54	1.54	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	94.90	1.02	3.06	0	0	1.02
5	0.99	0	0	1.48	92.11	3.94	0.98	0	0.50
6	0	0.87	0	0	1.74	94.78	0.87	0	1.74
7	0	0	0	0	0	2.78	83.33	0	13.89
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 1: Transition Matrix on 1990Q1

Based on real data, we can follow the Belkin et al's model structure, and generate data sets without losing the pattern that the real one shows. Macroeconomic data and real historical transition matrices are used as input to drive the simulation.

The macroeconomic data used for simulation was provided in the Federal Reserve supervisory scenarios, dating to 1/1976, and by Macroeconomic Advisors, dating to 1/1970. Three macroeconomic variables are chosen to build the model, they are CBOE Volatility

Index for S & P 500 Stock Price Index, Nominal GDP growth and Spread, Baa Corp Bond Yield less 10-Yr Treasury Yield.

The historical transition matrices are pulled out from S & G Credit Pro (https://www.spcreditpro. com). For computational concerning, we are going to re-scale the S & G rating grades as following:

S& P#	S& P rating	modeled binning
1	AAA	1
2	AA+	1
3	AA	1
4	AA-	1
5	A+	1
6	A	1
7	A-	1
8	BBB+	2
9	BBB	2
10	BBB-	2
11	BB+	3
12	BB	3
13	BB-	4
14	B+	5
15	B	6
16	B-	6
17	CCC+	7
18	CCC	7
19	CCC-	7
20	CC	8
21	C	8
22	D	9

Before we generate repeat observations of the transition matrices, we have to fix a set of true value of the parameters and the transition matrices. Apply (4) to real historical transition matrices, we can use the result as the true value of the Z_t. Then use (3) we can obtain the associated true transition matrices. The true value of the Z_t and the transition matrices will not be used in the estimation, they will only be used in generating the observations and conducting comparison.

Then we are going to generate the observations of the transition matrices. We disturb Z_t a little by adding a random variable to it, say

$$\widetilde{Z}_t = Z_t + a\eta$$

where η is standard normal distributed, and a is a constant. The repeat observations of the transition matrices can be generated by plugging $\widetilde{Z}_t$ back into Belkin et al's model.

4.2 Belkin et al's approach

We are intending to show how well Belkin et al's one-factor model explain the behavior of the default rate. To apply Belkin et al's approach, we have to follow a two steps' procedure.

1. Extract time series $\hat{Z}_t$ from the historical transition matrices
2. Inverse Z_{t+1} into the whole transition matrix

By the first step, we use formula (4) to do the trick. Of course, some predetermined parameters are required. The historical average transition matrix is given by

$$\bar{P}_{ij} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{t=1}^{N} P_{ij,t}$$

,then the threshold series can be calculated accordingly by following equation

$$\hat{x}_j^i = \Phi^{-1}\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{j} \bar{P}_{ik}\Big).$$

Meanwhile, the number of the grading categories $K = 8$, and by Basel III, ρ is given by $\rho = 0.12 + 0.12 * e^{-50*PD}$ in which PD is a predetermined K dimension constant.

Once we extract the series $\hat{Z}_t$, formula (3) can be used to get the associated transition matrices.

4.3 Macroeconomic-risk method

In our Macroeconomic-risk method, we use historical transition matrices and the selected micro-economic indexes as the input, and use least squares method to solve the linear model (10). The output would include the coefficients and the thresholds. Use formula (11) we can get the prediction of the transition matrix.

To make a fair comparison, we use the same macroeconomic indexes in the new method as the ones selected for the Belkin et al's method.

4.4 Simulating Results



Figure 1: PD_8

Figure 1 shows the result of an one-time simulation, in which green line is the true PD_t series, black line is the one-parameter estimator $\widehat{PD}_t^{Z}$ and the red line is the new estimator $\widehat{PD}_t^{New}$. We only show the graph for $G = 8$ down here.

We can see that the red line and the green line are almost stick together, however the black line is significantly diverse from the green line. If readers want to see the graph for $G = 1, \ldots, 7$, these graphs can be found in the appendix 1.

We illustrated what happens in a one time simulation. For repeat simulations, we use a different way to show the result. Denote the one-parameter estimator of PD_t by

using the kth observation is $\widehat{PD_t^k}$, and the new estimator of that is $\widetilde{PD_t^k}$, then the MSE of two estimators are respectively

$$MSE_Z = \frac{1}{K}\sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(PD_t - \widehat{PD_t^k}\right)^2$$

and

$$MSE_{New} = \frac{1}{K}\sum_{k=1}^{K}\left(PD_t - \widetilde{PD_t^k}\right)^2$$

We let $K = 1000$ and we get figure 2 as follows in which black line is the MSE curve



Figure 2: MSE of PD_8

for one-parameter estimator, red line is that of new estimator. This graph clearly shows that, in 1000 times average, the new estimator is closer to the true value.



(a) MSE OF PD_1



(b) MSE OF PD_2



(c) MSE OF PD_3



(d) MSE OF PD_4



(e) MSE OF PD_5



(f) MSE OF PD_6



(g) MSE OF PD_7



(h) MSE OF PD_8

Figure 3: MSE OF PD



(a) PD_1

(b) PD_2



(c) PD_3



(d) PD_4



(e) PD_5



(f) PD_6



(g) PD_7



(h) PD_8

Figure 4: One time simulation PD

References

[1] F. Alessandrini, Credit risk, interest rate risk, and the business cycle. Journal of Fixed Income 9(2) (1999), 42-53.

[2] B. Belkin, S. Suchower, L.R. Forest, The effect of systematic credit risk on loan portfolio value-at-risk and loan pricing. Working paper, KPMG Peat Marwick LLP, 1998.

[3] B. Belkin, S. Suchower, L. R. Forest, A one-parameter representation of credit risk and transition matrices. Working paper, KPMG Peat Marwick LLP, 1998.

[4] B. Engelmann, K. Ermakov, The Basel II Risk Parameters, Chapter 6, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011.

[5] R. Jarrow, D. Lando, S. Turnbull, A Markov model for the term structure of credit risk spreads. Review of Financial Studies 10(2) (1997), 481-523.

[6] J. Kim, Conditioning the transition matrix, Credit Risk, a special report by Risk, 1999, 37-40.

[7] P. Nickell, W. Perraudin, S. Varotto, Stability of rating transitions. Journal of Banking and Finance, 24 (1/2) (2000), 203-227.

[8] J. Wei, A multi-factor, credit migration model for sovereign and corporate debts. Journal of International Money and Finance, 22 (2003), 709-735.

[9] T. Wilson, Credit risk modeling: A new approach. Unpublished mimeo. McKinsey Inc., New York, 1997.